

Beland vol 10

A
L E T T E R
TO
Lord Viscount Beauchamp,
UPON THE
SUBJECT OF HIS LETTER
TO THE
FIRST BELFAST COMPANY OF
VOLUNTEERS,
IN THE
PROVINCE OF ULSTER.

Those whom God hath joined together, let no Man put asunder.
COMMON PRAYER BOOK.

THE SECOND EDITION.

L O N D O N:
PRINTED FOR JOHN DEBRETT,
(Successor to Mr. ALMON) opposite Burlington-House, Piccadilly.

M D C C L X X X I I I .

[Price One Shilling.]



A
L E T T E R
T O
L O R D B E A U C H A M P,
Esq. Esq. Esq.

MY LORD,

IN offering to the public consideration the following remarks upon your Lordship's late publication, I feel that I am soliciting their attention to a subject upon which the general anxiety had, in a great measure, subsided on the other side, and had, I believe, altogether ceased on this side of the water,

B

until

until your Lordship thought proper to revive the discussion of it. The transactions of the last Sessions of the Parliament of both kingdoms, have been here considered as conclusive with respect to the establishment of the independence of the Irish Legislature; and we have every reason to believe, that in the sister kingdom they are considered in the same light, by the most zealous and respectable assertors of her liberties, and by the body of the nation at large.— Whether we collect the sense of Ireland from her Parliament, which had, according to your Lordship, wisely placed herself at the head of an armed community, or from the resolutions of that armed community immediately following the proceedings of Parliament, or from the numerous affectionate addresses with which the Gazettes of both kingdoms teemed at that period, from every description

description and denomination of men, we can possibly draw but one inference, namely, that the adjustment of the matters in dispute between the two kingdoms, (emphatically distinguished by the epithet of final) which immediately succeeded the appointment of Lord Rockingham's administration, gave full and complete satisfaction to the people of Ireland.

It is not my intention at present, to enter into a discussion of the question of repeal and renunciation, which has been so long agitated and so fully considered on the other side of the water, further than may be necessary to point out some mistakes which occur in your Lordship's performance, which would almost lead one to suppose you unacquainted with the grounds on which the respective partizans of the above-

mentioned doctrines have carried on that controversy. How, otherwise, are we to account for your Lordship's writing as follows, relative to the second resolution moved in the House of Commons of England, by Mr. Fox :

“ However these words (i. e. the
 “ words of the resolution) may since
 “ have been cavilled at, the intention of
 “ them undoubtedly was this: that
 “ Great Britain would secure, by an act
 “ of her own, the liberties of Ireland
 “ from any future violation, and in the
 “ mean time would prove her sincerity,
 “ by the repeal of the 6th of George
 “ the First. If the repeal then only
 “ has taken place, and no further mea-
 “ sures are pursued to secure the con-
 “ nexion on a solid and permanent
 “ basis, is it not a confession on the part
 “ of this country, that the Ministers
 “ have

“ have left the great work of settlement
“ incomplete?”

It seems here necessary to apprise your Lordship, that those who have contended the repeal to be sufficient, have always argued that repeal, with its concomitant circumstances, to have amounted to a full and unequivocal renunciation of the right, on the part of the British Parliament. Consequently, they consider the repeal of the 6th of George the First, together with the circumstances under which it passed, namely, the addresses of the Parliament denying the assumed right of England, then lying on the tables of both Houses, as the only act necessary in the British Parliament to secure the rights of Ireland from future violation. And so far is your Lordship from concurring in opinion with those whose doctrines you seem

mentioned doctrines have carried on that controversy. How, otherwise, are we to account for your Lordship's writing as follows, relative to the second resolution moved in the House of Commons of England, by Mr. Fox :

“ However these words (i. e. the
 “ words of the resolution) may since
 “ have been cavilled at, the intention of
 “ them undoubtedly was this: that
 “ Great Britain would secure, by an act
 “ of her own, the liberties of Ireland
 “ from any future violation, and in the
 “ mean time would prove her sincerity,
 “ by the repeal of the 6th of George
 “ the First. If the repeal then only
 “ has taken place, and no further mea-
 “ sures are pursued to secure the con-
 “ nexion on a solid and permanent
 “ basis, is it not a confession on the part
 “ of this country, that the Ministers
 “ have

“ have left the great work of settlement
 “ incomplete?”

It seems here necessary to apprise your Lordship, that those who have contended the repeal to be sufficient, have always argued that repeal, with its concomitant circumstances, to have amounted to a full and unequivocal renunciation of the right, on the part of the British Parliament. Consequently, they consider the repeal of the 6th of George the First, together with the circumstances under which it passed, namely, the addresses of the Parliament denying the assumed right of England, then lying on the tables of both Houses, as the only act necessary in the British Parliament to secure the rights of Ireland from future violation. And so far is your Lordship from concurring in opinion with those whose doctrines you
 seem

seem anxious to support, on the other side of the water, in thinking, that “ further measures should have been “ pursued, to secure the connexion on a “ solid and permanent basis,” that soon after the proceedings of the British Parliament had been communicated to that of Ireland, Mr. Flood, in order to prevent any further step being taken in the Parliament of England, moved the following resolution :

Resolved,

That a solid basis of permanent connexion does at present subsist between Great Britain and Ireland, inasmuch as they must by law always have one common Sovereign, and that the approbation of that Sovereign, under the Great Seal of England, must be had to any bill before it can become law in Ireland.

That

That Mr. Flood's object was such as I have already stated, appears from his offering to withdraw this motion, provided the Secretary would pledge himself that no further measures in the British Parliament were then in contemplation. The Secretary replied, that it was impossible for him to pledge himself for what might, or might not be proposed in Parliament; but upon his declaration that he knew of no intention in his Majesty's Ministers to bring forward any further measure, the House superseded the resolution moved by Mr. Flood, by calling for the order of the day.

This fact, which is incontrovertible, and may be authenticated by referring to the Journals of the House, is sufficient to demonstrate that your Lordship has been utterly mistaken, in supposing
that

that any further measure to secure the connexion on a solid and permanent basis was from his Majesty's Ministers expected, or would have been approved in Ireland; in this opinion, therefore, your Lordship differs from the whole House of Commons of Ireland, and more especially from Mr. Flood, the mover of the above-mentioned resolution.

Your Lordship proceeds to quote part of your speech in the British Parliament, in which you observed, "That unless the repeal of the Declaratory Act was attended with an express renunciation of the right to bind Ireland by British acts of Parliament, you *knew* that Ireland would not be satisfied:"

Now, my Lord, that Ireland would not have been satisfied unless she conceived

ceived the principle of this bill to have been wholly given up by the repeal, always coupled with the circumstances which accompanied it, I do most readily admit ; but it is surely not very much to be wondered at, that the Parliament of England, conceiving the Parliament of Ireland (which moreover had been unanimous in stating their demands) *knew*, at least as well as your Lordship, what would or would not satisfy their constituents, and not finding in their addresses any demand of such express renunciation, should not have thought themselves obliged by the assertion of an individual, however respectable, or however likely to be well acquainted with the temper and disposition of the sister kingdom, to do what she herself, when solemnly called to state the whole extent of her demands, had not thought it necessary to require.

C

The

The manner in which the accounts of these proceedings were received in Ireland, fully justified the conduct of the British Ministry and Parliament, and was certainly a direct contradiction of what your Lordship states yourself to have so positively asserted. The House of Commons of Ireland voted an address of complete satisfaction, with two dissenting voices only (and it is to be observed that Mr. Flood was not one of them). They voted 20,000 men for the sea, and offered 5000 troops for the land service. The House of Lords shewed equal marks of satisfaction. Addresses, replete with gratitude and affection, poured in from every corner of the island, and delegates from Dungannon were appointed to lay the heartfelt testimony of national content at the foot of the Sovereign of Ireland, in his palace at St. James's.

The

The adjustment of these differences has since been justly stiled the peace of Ireland, and, I believe, struck a far more serious terror into the heart of the common enemy, than that which has since been said to have been produced by the unavailing efforts of ministerial ingenuity to draw resources from voluntary contributions, whose efficacy at present seems far less dubious than their legality, and which, whatever may be their future consequences to the constitution, do not appear to threaten much immediate danger to the enemies of Great-Britain. It is true that since the ratification of that peace, which could not but give the most sincere satisfaction to the real friends of both kingdoms, too many have endeavoured to disturb it, by disseminating doubts of the good faith of one, and insinuations against the good

C 2

policy

policy of the other of the contracting parties. In Ireland the public has had little difficulty in accounting for the conduct of those, who, though parties, as far at least as acquiescence could make them such, in adopting the mode which the Parliament of Ireland judged sufficiently secure, have since laboured with indefatigable industry to persuade their countrymen that no real security for their constitution has been obtained; nay, I will venture to assert, that scarcely one individual in Ireland has been forward in spreading these groundless jealousies, whose motives have not been so undisguised, that the common decency of glossing them over with the bare appearance of principle has been almost wholly neglected. Their success has consequently been proportioned to their credit with the public; and though columns of volunteer resolutions,

tions, accompanied by addresſes of the moſt fulſome adulation to the moſt reprobated characters, generally conceived in a ſtrain of language proving their authors to be of a claſs of men whoſe education has not placed them in a ſphere of life to merit much conſideration in an enlightened community, may alarm common readers of Irifh papers, unacquainted with the real ſtate and temper of the country: thoſe who have opportunities and means of being better informed muſt be well convinced that the bulk of the nation conſider the object as attained, and wiſh to ſee a perfect reſtoration of that harmony between the kingdoms which they feel to be the intereſt of both. But when a nobleman of your Lordſhip's diſtinguiſhed talents, and great conſideration in both countries, thinks fit to place yourſelf at the head of theſe mal-

malcontents, to stimulate them to further demands, to exhort them to persevere, and to represent the helpless condition of Great-Britain as an encouragement to their future efforts, the public must indeed be at a loss to determine to what cause they are to ascribe a conduct so apparently desperate, so really dangerous. Severe observers have, in the sister kingdom, attributed to the loudest declaimer in favour of your Lordship's doctrines motives of faction and disappointment. They have accounted for it by the envious spleen with which he saw a virtuous government consult, and a grateful country reward, distinguished talents and incorruptible integrity. A conduct and a countenance that bespoke a Catiline, seemed to authorise so harsh a judgment; but with your Lordship, no less remarkable for the amenity of
your

your manners in private, than for your apparent aversion from all violence in public life, no such sinister motives can be supposed to have preponderated ; nor can the most uncharitable interpretation of human actions attribute to a nobleman of such elegant accomplishments, the heir of such princely possessions, of so placid a nature, and one who “ has borne his faculties so meekly,” the same seditious and sordid springs of action, which may be thought to have actuated a fretful or an avaricious mind, smarting under the recent losses of official dignity and emolument.

To return to your Lordship’s speech, you added, that “ Unless the reasons
 “ for originally passing the act were
 “ disclaimed in the preamble, or that
 “ enacting words were introduced into
 “ the body of the bill, which might
 “ bind

“ bind the faith and honour of all future
 “ Parliaments, it could not be received
 “ by the Irish nation but as a half
 “ measure.”

Here again, I find myself obliged to differ from your Lordship, and am clearly of opinion, that the conduct of Ministers was well considered and judicious ; to have arraigned the justice and policy of our ancestors, at a moment when the whole world will not agree with your Lordship, “ that the Parlia-
 “ of Great-Britain was restored to its
 “ free agency,” would have been pitiful and indecent ; to have attempted to bind the hands of our posterity would have been absurd, because impossible. No preamble renouncing the exercise could have been framed which did not, by implication, assert the existence of the disputed right ; an asser-
 tion

tion directly contradictory to the addresses of Ireland, the acknowledged grounds upon which the Parliament of England was proceeding to repeal the obnoxious statute. A preamble utterly denying such right ever to have existed, could scarcely have been made palatable to the Parliament of England, however desirous of closing the account for ever with England, nor would the generosity of Ireland have wished to compel Great-Britain to so unnecessary, and so humiliating a concession; the pride of both kingdoms was to be attended to, and no measure less galling to that passion, to which nations as well as individuals are liable, could have been devised, than a naked repeal of the act complained of, together with all things therein contained. The claim of binding Ireland; the people of Ireland expected you to retract; the right of binding her they

D

never

never acknowledged, and therefore never required you to renounce.

It is true, that immediately after the settlement of these matters, a gentleman, of whose motives the public has not formed the most favourable opinion, endeavoured to propagate the doctrines of which, it seems, your Lordship was the author; but so few proselytes were converted to the true faith by this indefatigable apostle, that it was in a short time abandoned, even by himself, and the necessity of an Irish Bill of Rights was substituted in its place, as a measure more likely to procure what this unwearied agitator styles *national* support, than a renunciation of right on the part of England, the necessity of which was, in truth, rather humiliating than flattering to the pride of Ireland.

I have

I have no doubt however, but upon your Lordship's having spread forth your banner, he will most chearfully return to it, and the late resolution of the Committee of the Lawyers Corps, in contradiction to those unanimously passed by both Houses of Parliament in Ireland, seems to indicate a ready disposition, and laudable alacrity to take the field under your Lordship's auspices. And though in the conclusion of your letter, should the Irish nation, upon mature reflection, determine to leave the great question of her rights in its present situation, your Lordship has threatened to close your lips upon the subject for ever, I do not despair of seeing your Lordship addressed, and eagerly entreated by some of the warmest of these Patriotic Associations, to move in the Parliament of England a

renunciation of right, which the Parliament of Ireland, upon the most mature reflection, shall have judged it unnecessary and inexpedient to demand.

Your Lordship next mentions the surprize which you, with many others, felt, upon finding that the Ministerial plan consisted of a simple repeal of the Declaratory Act, a surprize which nothing could heighten but the answer you received from the highest authority, to a proposal you made of amending it, in the manner you have described, viz. that it was not the wish of Ireland; that she was satisfied with the bill in its present form; that Ministers were assured so by those who stood highest in the confidence of the nation, with whom the Irish Administration was in the habit of consulting. To such information
you

you add, you thought yourself bound to submit.

Let me ask your Lordship, and appeal to your own candour, whether you found yourself deceived by this information? Let me ask your Lordship, whether those who stood highest in the confidence of Ireland did, or did not authorize the Administration of Ireland to make the assertion, and whether their public conduct did not justify the Minister of England in acting upon it? Mr. Burgh and Mr. Yelverton became themselves immediately part of the Irish Administration; Lord Charlemont, Lord Mornington, Mr. Grattan, Mr. Brownlow, and Mr. Ogle, gave them the most strenuous and decided support.

Believe me, my Lord, notwithstanding all the industry of your Lordship's

Lordship's libellous associates on the other side of the water, these are still the characters that possess national confidence in Ireland. By the transactions of the two Parliaments, the faith of both nations became pledged to each other. They are not the friends of either, but more especially of Ireland, who are the first to weaken the mutual engagement. Let any one reflect what advantages a Minister, not well disposed to the independence of the Irish legislature, might derive from your Lordship's and Mr. Flood's arguments in support of Lord Abingdon's bill, should his Lordship think fit to revive the consideration of it. Perhaps your Lordship may convince the Earl of Shelburne that such a measure would, in fact, be no breach of faith on the part of England.

No

No honest Minister, says your Lordship, will think himself warranted, no wise Minister will dare to make the attempt. Yet your Lordship, Mr. Flood, and the Lawyers Committee, who have declared, that the British Parliament has not surrendered the claim to bind Ireland, furnish the only grounds upon which a weak and wicked Minister can justify such a conduct.

The mention of the Committee of the Lawyers Corps, leads me to take notice of the extraordinary proceeding of those gentlemen, to which your Lordship's friends, on the other side of the water, seem disposed to give a degree of importance, that I confess it does not appear to me to be by any means entitled to. The origin of that proceeding, with which many on the other

other side of the water are not acquainted, was as follows.

On the 19th of July Mr. Flood moved in the House of Commons of Ireland the heads of a bill, the purport of which was, as he averred, to bind for ever the two crowns of England and Ireland, and to separate the jurisdiction of the two legislatures; declaring and enacting, that whenever the King should give his assent to any British act, purporting to bind Ireland, then, and from thenceforward, that law which declares the Imperial Crown of Ireland inseparably annexed to the crown of Great-Britain should be, *ipso facto*, repealed. To such a bill, your Lordship has, in your letter, stated some very forcible objections; but the rejection of it in the Irish House of Commons, which was without a division, as it appeared, that
fix

fix members only were disposed to give it their support, was grounded upon different reasons, as appears by the resolution moved in the close of that day's business by Mr. Grattan.

Resolved,

That leave was refused to bring in the bill, because the sole and exclusive right to legislate for Ireland in all cases whatsoever, internally and externally, has been asserted by the Parliament of Ireland, and has been fully, finally, and irrevocably acknowledged by the British Parliament.

The word finally, which is important, and the word irrevocably, which is nonsense, were both inserted at the suggestion of Mr. Flood ; that great orator, who

E

had

had been himself moving a bill which should in a given case separate the Crowns of Great Britain and Ireland, declared by a former act to be inseparably connected, might surely have been sensible that no act, whether of the English or Irish Parliament, could be justly qualified with the epithet of irrevocable.

At a meeting of the Lawyers Corps, assembled the next day, the following resolution, after a long debate, was carried:

Resolved,

That a committee of nine be now elected by ballot, to enquire and report to this Corps, on the 17th of November next, whether any, and if any, what acts have been done by the British Parliament, whereby it must be deemed
to

to have fully, finally, and irrevocably, acknowledged the sole exclusive right of the Irish Parliament to legislate for this country in all cases, as well external as internal.

Mr. Flood having been the supposed author of this resolve, had perhaps suggested the word irrevocably in order to betray the House of Commons into an absurdity, which he should afterwards persuade the Lawyers Corps to contradict; one might indeed have imagined, that it was scarcely necessary for these profound lawyers to employ so long a time as from the 19th of July to the 17th of November, to deliberate whether the British Parliament had, or had not passed an irrevocable act. Be that as it may, the resolution of the House of Commons was evidently calculated to quiet, the resolution of the Lawyers

Corps as evidently calculated to disturb the minds of the people.

On the 17th of November, this learned and enlightened committee, (having, it seems, bestowed great attention, and employed uncommon industry in considering the question referred to them) made a very long report concluding as follows :

On the whole, your committee are unanimously of opinion, that the British Parliament have not done any act whatsoever whereby they must or can be deemed to have fully, finally, irrevocably, or in any adequate manner, acknowledged the sole and exclusive right of the Irish Parliament to legislate for this country in all cases, as well external as internal.

On

On the 20th of November, on a division of 77 to 21, the corps agreed to the report of the committee, adding resolutions containing hints to the Parliament of Great Britain, that a voluntary and express renunciation of the claim on their part would be highly acceptable to the people of Ireland:

Perhaps your Lordship may be of opinion, that the Parliament of Great Britain ought to proceed on the resolutions of the Lawyers Corps, in preference to those of the Parliament of Ireland, speaking confessedly the sense of their constituents, as far at least as public declarations, county meetings, and addresses from all classes of citizens are a test of it.

I submit to your Lordship, whether such a mode of proceeding would become

come the dignity of the Parliament of Great Britain; I think I may venture to assert boldly, that it would not be altogether respectful to that august assembly in the sister kingdom; this consideration, however, I do not expect to have much weight with your Lordship, since you express a total disapprobation of any delicacy on the part of the volunteers towards the Parliament, and see no reason whatever against their setting the last hand to this important business during the recess.

The question, says your Lordship, is really this, " Shall Ireland have a parliamentary constitution or not? For that body is improperly called a Parliament, whose deliberations are liable to be controlled by any power upon earth."

Give

Give me leave to ask, my Lord, by what power are the deliberations of the Parliament of Ireland liable to be controlled? The usurped power (for it was never legal) of altering bills is taken from the Privy Councils of both kingdoms, by the late modification of Poyning's Law; the negative of the Crown (which, in the case of Ireland, is exercised by the English Privy Council) is a controul upon the determinations of both Parliaments.

Possibly your Lordship may agree with Mr. Flood, in wishing to take away the power of suppressing bills in the Privy Council of England, and consequently leave no bond of connexion whatever between the two kingdoms, but the unity of the Crown: a connexion from which I can conceive many disadvantages to both, and no possible benefit
to

to either; a connexion which must inevitably endanger the liberties of England, by adding considerably to the strength of the Crown; and no security for the freedom of her constitution, which Ireland shall endeavour to obtain, can avail her to preserve that constitution, if the liberties of England are to be sacrificed in pursuit of the object.

Your Lordship is of opinion, that an increase of weight thrown into the popular scale of Great Britain, will not diminish the risk of Ireland. Does your Lordship apprehend no danger to the liberties of Ireland, from an increase of power in the Crown in Great Britain? It cannot be less the interest of Ireland to maintain the power of Parliament in England, than her own; for when once the liberties of Great Britain are overwhelmed, your Lordship, Mr. Flood, and

and the Committee of the Lawyers Corps may devise whatever legal security for the freedom of the Irish constitution your ingenuity or sagacity may suggest, but I do not believe the people of Ireland will be in a condition to reap much benefit from the effect of your speculations.

In the latter part of your letter, your Lordship, applauding the wisdom of our ancestors at the glorious æra of the Revolution, has the following observation: “ High as the pulse of the
 “ public beat for liberty, after that
 “ memorable æra, and anxious as the
 “ nation was to prevent in future the
 “ mischief which they had so lately
 “ escaped,* this mode of obtaining security was never resorted to. The
 F “ Par-

* By an act to define the cases wherein the crown should be forfeited.

“ Parliament abolished the dangerous
 “ branches of the prerogative, which
 “ King James had abused. They re-
 “ duced the theory of our constitution
 “ to such clear and fixed principles,
 “ that no sovereign in future could err
 “ but by design ; but here they wisely
 “ stopped: if they never attempted
 “ defining cases in which the crown
 “ should again be forfeited, I have a
 “ right to conclude that they regarded
 “ the expedient as unnecessary and dan-
 “ gerous ; unnecessary, because when
 “ the measure of oppression is full, the
 “ subject will seek his safety in re-
 “ sistance, whether invited to it by an
 “ act of parliament or not.”

Will your Lordship observe how pre-
 cisely what you here apply to the good
 policy of our ancestors, in abstaining
 from resorting to unnecessary securities,

at

at the time of the Revolution, may, *mutatis mutandis*, be with equal truth said of the conduct of the Irish Parliament upon the late adjustment. Might not a writer, speaking on that subject, and almost adopting your Lordship's own expressions, say,—

“ High as the public pulse beat
 “ for liberty, after that memorable æra,
 “ and anxious as the nation was to
 “ prevent in future the mischief (i. e.
 “ being subject to a foreign legislature)
 “ from which they had so lately escaped,
 “ any further mode of obtaining security was never resorted to. The
 “ Parliament (of Ireland) denied the
 “ authority which the Parliament of
 “ England had claimed and exercised,
 “ and asserted the freedom of their constitution in such clear and explicit
 “ terms, that no future English Parliament could err but by design. If they

“ never attempted obtaining a legal
 “ security, I have a right to conclude
 “ that they regarded the expedient as
 “ unnecessary and absurd ; unnecessary,
 “ because when the measure of op-
 “ pression is full, the subject will seek
 “ his safety in resistance, whether in-
 “ vited to it by act of parliament or
 “ not.”

In your last assertion, my Lord, you certainly are founded, and should England ever violate her faith, and revive the claim which she has in fact surrendered, the measure of oppression will be full ; nor will Ireland then need the invitation, either of a bill of rights of her own, or a formal renunciation of the right on the part of England, to rouse her to resistance ; she will appeal to the justice of her cause, and the spirit of her people. But is it credible
 that

that England, after the fatal but instructive lesson she has received from the successful resistance of America, actuated by the same tyrannical principles, will commit still more flagrant injustice, and hazard, by so nefarious and impolitic a conduct, a further dismemberment of the empire? I say, a still more flagrant injustice, because, although I consider the attempt to tax America, by the tea duty, as a breach of faith on the part of England, who, by the repeal of the Stamp-Act, had, by implication, relinquished the exercise of the right she claimed, it is to be observed that the repeal of that statute was accompanied by the Declaratory Act, asserting, to its utmost extent, the existence of the right. This important difference therefore obviously exists in the cases of America and Ireland; the remonstrances of the first
were

were listened to, but the redress given was accompanied by a law asserting the unlimited right of the Parliament of England : the complaints of the latter were heard, and answered by the immediate repeal of a similar statute, which could bear no other construction than that of an unequivocal renunciation of the contested claim.

Your Lordship, however, declares yourself to be of too timid a nature not to foresee dangers to the rights of Ireland in the future prosperity of England; and I must acknowledge that your Lordship has painted that danger with an ingenuity, which I trust you will forgive me for saying, does infinitely more honour to your talents than your patriotism. “ Great-Britain,” says your Lordship, “ by rigid œconomy, and accommodating her conduct

“ duct to her circumstances, may, after
 “ a few years peace, recover a great
 “ proportion of her strength;” and
 then your Lordship proceeds to shew,
 that, looking to her commerce only as
 the foundation of her revenue and
 navy, she must necessarily become jea-
 lous of the advantages which the free
 trade has given to Ireland. It is surely
 unnecessary to point out the conse-
 quences which flow from this mode
 of reasoning. Your Lordship in every
 thing seems disposed to adopt the prin-
 ciples of Mr. Flood. He has main-
 tained the strength of England to be
 the weakness of Ireland: the wisest,
 most respectable, and most popular
 Administration was, in his opinion,
 more alarming to the interests of Ire-
 land than the weak and incapable Mi-
 nistry with which your Lordship was
 connected. What are your Lordship
 and

and Mr. Flood labouring to prove, but that the two kingdoms are by nature enemies; and what can be the consequence of the success of your reasonings, but lighting up a flame of discord between them, to be extinguished only by their separation? Without being disposed to question the rectitude of your Lordship's intentions, without wishing to put an invidious construction upon that zeal for the rights of Ireland, which induces you to hold forth the deplorable situation of Great-Britain, struggling with an host of enemies, as an incentive to her further demands, I own I am at a loss to reconcile this and some other parts of your letter, with the ardent wishes with which you conclude, for the eternal preservation of the connexion between the two kingdoms.

I cannot

I cannot take my leave of your Lordship, without returning you my thanks, however, for that judicious resolution with which you are pleased to conclude, that should the Irish nation determine to leave the great question of her rights in its present situation, your lips shall be forever closed upon the subject; and I am the more anxious to take notice of this resolution, because I perceive already that your Lordship is called upon by some corps of volunteers, to “ follow up your sentiments,” by obtaining a solemn disavowal of the claim formerly assumed by the British Parliament to legislate for Ireland.

I have too good an opinion of your Lordship's prudence, to think you will be much disposed to attend to this call; but, if in the warm pursuit of Irish popularity, you should be led once

G

more

more to stir in the Parliament of England a subject of such delicacy, that men, less cautious than your Lordship, have not heard the discussion of it, without trembling, I trust your Lordship will be able to lay before that assembly, some more urgent reasons than any which are contained in the Letter upon which I have presumed to animadvert, for reviving the consideration of

———— Matter deep and dangerous,
 As full of peril,
 As to o'erwalk a current roaring loud
 On the unstedfast footing of a spear.

SHAKESPEARE.

To conclude, I am very willing to admit that your Lordship has, in your parliamentary conduct, ever manifested a strong desire of being thought friendly to that part of the empire, to which a
 very

very considerable property has naturally implanted in your Lordship's bosom an ardent and affectionate attachment. Perhaps, had similar reasons weighed with you in favour of those provinces which were once the British colonies in North America, we should not have seen in a strenuous advocate for a free constitution in one of the dependencies of the British empire, as equally strenuous an abettor of measures calculated to subvert the vital principles of freedom in another.

Your Lordship need not be informed, that the persons to whom your letter is addressed have ever been utterly averse to the reprobated American war, of which you, my Lord, have been an uniform supporter.

The honest Presbyterians of the North of Ireland, will not, perhaps, be highly gratified in learning that your Lordship, and their *respectable* countryman, Lord Nugent, (with whose political virtues they are not unacquainted) are the warmest supporters of their rights on this side of the water ; nor even should their equally respectable and equally respected countryman, Lord Hillsborough, join the holy band of newly-converted patriots, and in conjunction with Mr. Flood, and the late Attorney-General, Mr. Scott, preach up the doctrine of renunciation, will his Lordship's conduct towards their American brethren, impress their minds with the most favourable opinion of the sincerity of his Lordship's zeal for the liberties of Ireland.

The

The inhabitants of that part of the island, my Lord, are steady and consistent friends to liberty, and *really* attached to the principles of (what your Lordship has distinguished by the epithet of memorable, but what they are accustomed to style) the glorious Revolution of 1688.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your very humble servant,

P O S T S C R I P T.

SINCE writing the Letter which I have taken the liberty of addressing to your Lordship, I find that your partisans in Ireland are assiduously endeavouring to take advantage of a recent event in this kingdom, I mean the Earl of Mansfield's decree in an appeal by writ of error to the Court of King's Bench in England, to increase the alarms, which they are hopeful, in conjunction with your Lordship, to have so effectually implanted in the bosoms of their countrymen, that the conflict between the kingdoms may still be kept alive, on which, and on which alone, their future importance must depend. If the repeal of the 6th of Geo. I. was valued at 50,000l. perhaps Mr. Flood may expect twice that sum for an Irish bill of rights; your Lordship too seems inclined to be an adventurer in this new species of lottery. By the publication of your Letter to the Belfast Company, you have stamped your name upon your ticket, and have thrown it into the wheel to take its chance. National generosity

rosity is extensive; and as no generosity is so extensive as that which is indulged at the expence of others, your Lordship, in the ferment of the times, and the vicissitude of events, by parliamentary profusion, may be adjudged deserving of a prize. A renunciation of right, carried in the English Parliament by your Lordship, would be no trifling claim on the generosity of Ireland. What price can be too high for freedom? And while the munificence of her Parliament offers such noble encouragement, neither on this nor on the other side of the water will the liberties of Ireland ever stand in need of champions.

I am far from suspecting, however, that your Lordship will give your sanction to the gross artifice of endeavouring to complicate two subjects so distinct as those of legislative and judicial supremacy. The fact is, that the final jurisdiction of the Lords of Ireland, though, in my opinion, very judiciously enrolled among the demands of Ireland, in order to close the account for ever, never was a subject upon which the public pulse beat high. The appeal to the King's Bench in England, founded on the common law, had never been complained of as a grievance, but when once the removal of it was known to be the wish of Ireland, not being a further

render of power, it was not likely to prove a matter of dispute between the kingdoms. The repeal of the 6th of Geo. I. however, was certainly not adequate to remove the appeal to the courts of England, and consequently an Irish act of parliament was passed for that purpose. Whether an English judge is bound, or indeed whether he with propriety can take notice of an Irish law in an English court of judicature, I know not; but I am confident, that if an English act be necessary upon this subject, it will not meet with a dissenting voice in the Parliament of England.

I could not help adding one word upon this matter, because it seems to have been so grossly misrepresented, though I trust it can hardly be misunderstood, on the other side of the water. It was not, however, my intention to impute to your Lordship any share in the misrepresentation of this business, as it would give me the most real concern to be supposed to have unjustly charged, with a seditious or sinister practice, a person, who, to the real friends and good men of both kingdoms, has, I fear, already much to answer for.

F I N I S.







